

Multi Loci Phylogenetic Analysis with Gene Tree Clustering

Ruriko Yoshida Kenji Fukumizu

March 13, 2022

Abstract

Theory and empirical evidence clearly indicate that phylogenies (trees) of different genes (loci) should not display precisely matched topologies. The main reason for such phylogenetic incongruence is reticulated evolutionary history of most species due to meiotic sexual recombination in eukaryotes, or horizontal transfers of genetic materials in prokaryotes. Nevertheless, most genes should display topologically related phylogenies, and should group into one or more (for genetic hybrids) clusters in the “tree space.” In this paper we propose to apply the normalized-cut (Ncut) clustering algorithm to the set of gene trees with the geodesic distance between trees over the Billera-Holmes-Vogtmann (BHV) tree space. We first show by simulated data sets that the Ncut algorithm accurately clusters the set of gene trees given a species tree under the coalescent process, and show that the Ncut algorithm works better on the gene trees reconstructed via the neighbor-joining method than these reconstructed via the maximum likelihood estimator under the evolutionary models. Moreover, we apply the methods to a genome-wide data set (1290 genes encoding 690,838 amino acid residues) on coelacanths, lungfishes, and tetrapods. The result suggests that there are two clusters in the data set. Finally we reconstruct the consensus trees from these two clusters; the consensus tree constructed from one cluster has the tree topology that coelacanths are most closely related to the tetrapods, and the consensus tree from the other includes an irresolvable trichotomy over the coelacanth, lungfish, and tetrapod lineages, suggesting divergence within a very short time interval.

1 Introduction

The field of phylogenetics has been undergoing a gradual paradigm shift away from the notion of the strictly bifurcating, completely re-

solved species trees, to a recognition that species are containers of allelic variation for each gene. It is very well established that differences in lineage sorting due to genetic drift lead to differences in phylogenetic tree topologies (Maddison, 1997). Gene flow in ancestral populations and independent lineage sorting of polymorphisms is fully expected to generate topological conflicts between gene trees in reticulating (e.g., sexually recombining) species (Huson *et al.*, 2005, Weisrock *et al.*, 2006, Taylor *et al.*, 2000). Both extant and ancestral species could exhibit this phenomenon, so ancestral species should not be regarded as node points in a fully resolved bifurcating tree, but instead can be thought of as spatiotemporal clouds of individual genotypes with all their inherent allelism. Thus, a central issue in systematic biology is the reconstruction of populations and species from numerous gene trees with varying levels of discordance (Brito and Edwards, 2009, Edwards, 2009). While there has been a well-established understanding of the discordant phylogenetic relationships that can exist among independent gene trees drawn from a common species tree (Pamilo and Nei, 1988, Takahata, 1989, Maddison, 1997, Bollback and Huelsenbeck, 2009), phylogenetic studies have only recently begun to shift away from single gene or concatenated gene estimates of phylogeny towards these multi-locus approaches (e.g. Carling and Brumfield (2008), Yu *et al.* (2011), Betancur *et al.* (2013), Heled and Drummond (2011), Thompson and Kubatko (2013)).

Numerous processes can reduce the correlation among gene trees. Negative or balancing selection on a particular locus is expected to increase the probability that ancestral gene copies are maintained through speciation events (Takahata and Nei, 1990). Horizontal transfer shuffles divergent genes among different species (Maddison, 1997). The correlation may also be reduced by naive sampling of loci for analysis. For example, paralogous gene copies will result in a gene tree that conflates gene duplication with speciation. Similarly, sampled sequence data that span one or more recombination events will yield “gene trees” that are hybrids of two or more genealogical histories (Posada and Crandall, 2002). These non-coalescent processes can strongly influence phylogenetic inference (Posada and Crandall, 2002, Martin and Burg, 2002, Edwards, 2009). In addition, Rivera *et al.* (1998) showed that an analysis of complete genomes indicated a massive prokaryotic gene transfer (or transfers) preceding the formation of the eukaryotic cell, arguing that there is significant genomic evidence for more than one distinct class of genes. These examples suggest that the distribution of eukaryotic gene trees may be more accurately modeled as a mixture of a number of more fundamental distributions. In order to find a mixture structure in distributions of gene trees, we first need to find how many components of distributions are in the mixture. Thus, in this paper we focus on the problem of clustering gene trees over the

“tree space”.

Many researchers take an approach to apply a likelihood based method, such as the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) or Bayesian inference on the *concatenated alignment* from gene alignments in order to reconstruct the species tree. However, Roch and Steel (2015) showed that if we apply a likelihood based method on the concatenated alignment from gene alignments, then the resulting trees might be statistically inconsistent because some gene trees are significantly incongruent from the species tree due to incomplete lineage sorting, horizontal gene transfer, and so on. More precisely, they showed that under the multi-species coalescent with a standard site substitution model, such as the general time reversible (GTR) model etc, the MLE on a sequence data concatenated across genes under the assumption that all sites have evolved independently and identically on a fixed tree is a statistically inconsistent estimator of the species tree.

One classical way to conduct a statistical analysis on phylogenetic trees is to map each tree to a vector in \mathbb{R}^d for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$, such as the *dissimilarity map*. Given any tree T of n leaves with branch length information, one may produce a corresponding *distance matrix*, $D(T)$. The distance matrix is an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix of non-negative real numbers, with elements corresponding to the sum of the branch lengths between pairs of leaves in the tree. To calculate $D_{(ij)}(T)$, one simply determines which edges of the tree form the path from a leaf i to a leaf j , and then sums the lengths of these branches. Since $D(T)$ is symmetric and has zeros on the diagonal, the upper-triangular portion of the matrix contains all of the unique information found in the matrix. We can vectorize a tree T by enumerating this unique portion of the distance matrix,

$$v_D(T) := (D_{12}(T), D_{13}(T), \dots, D_{23}(T), \dots, D_{n-1,n}(T))$$

which is called the *dissimilarity map* of a tree T and is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{2}}$.

However, the space of phylogenetic trees with n leaves is not a Euclidean space. In fact, it is a union of lower dimensional polyhedral cones in $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{2}}$. Billera *et al.* (2001) introduced a continuous space which explicitly models the set of rooted phylogenetic trees with edge lengths on a fixed set of leaves. Although the Billera-Holmes-Vogtmann (BHV) tree space is not Euclidean, it is non-positively curved, and thus any two points are connected by a unique shortest path through the space, called a *geodesic*.

This paper proposes a method of multi-loci phylogenetic analysis using gene tree clustering based on the distance matrix with the geodesic distance between two trees over the BHV tree space. In the analysis method, a given set of gene trees is clustered with the normalized cut (Ncut) algorithm (Shi and Malik, 2000), which can be

applied based on the distance matrix directly. As an alternative, a dimension reduction method can be applied to extract a low dimensional structure of data before the clustering. It helps also visualize the structure of data. As the method of dimension reductions, kernel principal component analysis (KPCA, Schölkopf *et al.* (1998)) and *t*-stochastic neighborhood embedding (*t*-SNE, van der Maaten and Hinton (2008)) are employed. We refer to the above three procedures of clustering as direct Ncut, KPCA Ncut, and *t*-SNE Ncut, respectively, hereafter.

Using simulated data sets generated by the software **Mesquite** (Maddison and Maddison, 2009), we first demonstrated that our proposed methods accurately cluster the set of gene trees given by a species tree under the coalescent process. We have also shown with the data sets that the Ncut algorithm works better on the gene trees reconstructed via the neighbor-joining (NJ) method (Saitou and Nei, 1987) than those reconstructed via the MLE under evolutionary models. In addition, we have observed that standard hierarchical clustering algorithms do not work as effectively as Ncut for finding the cluster structure.

We have next applied the three clustering methods to a genome-wide data set on coelacanth, lungfishes, and tetrapods from Amemiya *et al.* (2013), Liang *et al.* (2013), and have observed that there are reliable two clusters in the 1290 genes of coelacanth, lungfishes, and tetrapods. Finally we reconstructed the consensus trees using the NJ trees with bootstrap confidence for these clusters ≥ 0.95 (see Section 2.2 for more details). With these three different clustering algorithms we had consistent results on the consensus trees: the consensus tree from one cluster (of 858 gene trees with the direct Ncut, of 761 gene trees with the KPCA Ncut, and of 817 gene trees with *t*-SNE Ncut) supports the view of Fritzscht (1987), Gorr *et al.* (1991), that is, coelacanth are most closely related to the tetrapods; and the consensus tree constructed from the other cluster (of 322 gene trees with the direct Ncut algorithm, of 320 gene trees with the KPCA Ncut algorithm, and of 463 gene trees with *t*-SNE Ncut) supports the view of Takezaki *et al.* (2004), that is, the coelacanth, lungfish, and tetrapod lineages diverged within a very short time interval and that their relationships may represent an irresolvable trichotomy.

2 Results

2.1 Simulated data sets

The simulated data is generated as follows. We have fixed the population size $N_e = 10,000$ and we set the species depth $c \cdot N_e$ where $c = 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9, 1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 2$. Then for each species depth

$c \cdot N_e$ we generated 100 species trees from the Yule process and we picked randomly two trees from them. With each species tree, we generated 1000 random gene trees under the coalescent process within the species tree using the software *Mesquite* (Maddison and Maddison, 2009). To generate the sequences we have used the software *PAML* (Yang, 1997) under the Hasegawa-Kishino-Yano (HKY) (Hasegawa *et al.*, 1985) + Γ model with $\kappa = 4.0$, and the number of categories of the discrete gamma model is 1 with $\alpha = 1.0$. The frequencies for T, C, A, and G in the data are set as 0.15, 0.35, 0.15, 0.35, respectively. We set the length of sequences as 500. To reconstruct trees from these DNA sequences, we used the NJ algorithm with the p-distance (Saitou and Nei, 1987) (we call NJp method from here on) to reconstruct the NJ trees, and used the software *PHYML* (Guindon and Gascuel, 2003) to reconstruct MLE trees under the GTR model (Felsenstein, 1981), the HKY model, and the Kimura 2 parameter (K80) model (Kimura, 1980); they are denoted by MLE-GTR, MLE-HKY, and MLE-K80, respectively, from now on.

FIG. 1 shows the rates of correctly clustered genes by the three clustering methods: direct Ncut, KPCA Ncut, and t-SNE Ncut. Generally the accuracy is higher for larger species depths, which imply clearer separation. There is clear difference of accuracy between NJp and MLE tree reconstruction methods; the NJp method (solid lines) gives better clustering for all the three clustering methods. It is also notable that the accuracy has clear groups based on the clustering methods; t-SNE Ncut (broken lines), direct Ncut (dashed lines), and KPCA Ncut (dotted lines) give groups of similar accuracy levels in this order.

To see advantage of using the BHV tree space over Euclidean space, we applied the same clustering methods to Euclidean distance matrices $D(T)$ in $\mathbb{R}^{\binom{n}{2}}$, and compared the clustering accuracy. We show here in Table 1 only the results of the NJp and MLE-HKY with the species depths ratio $c = 0.8$ and 1.2 for simplicity. Full results are given in Supplementary Material S2. We can see from Table 1 that, for each of $c = 0.8, 1.2$, in most case the HBV tree space gives better clustering accuracy than Euclidean distances. Although, with KPCA and t-SNE for MLE-HKY for $c = 0.8$ and with KPCA for $c = 1.2$, the Euclidean distance gives more accurate clustering, their accuracy is much lower than those by NJp.

FIG. 2 shows two dimensional plots given by KPCA and t-SNE from the distance matrices made with NJp and MLE-HKY. (The other cases including the results for the distance matrices with the cone space are shown in Supplementary Material S3.) The green and pink colors indicate the correct clusters, which are not used for making the plots. The results indicates that in the case of $c = 1.2$ (ratio in the species depth) the dimension reduction methods provide clear clusters in the




Figure 1: Ncut Clustering accuracy for simulated data. NJp gives superior accuracy than MLE. The results of MLE show three groups depending on the three clustering methods.

two dimensional expression, while for $c = 0.8$, the clusters are less clear. In either species depth, the clusters are more vague for MLE-HKY. These observations match with the quantitative results in FIG. 1.

As a standard clustering method, we applied also hierarchical clustering to the simulated data. Note that it does not need original data points in making clusters, but can be applied only via a distance matrix. It is thus easily applied to data in the BHV tree space, once the distance matrix is given. The resulting two clusters were significantly imbalanced. With the methods of average and single linkage, the results always contain a cluster with only one point. With the complete linkage, in most cases the results contain a cluster only one or two points. When direct Ncut is applied, a cluster contain more points but the accuracy is at most 0.67 for all the species depths. The detailed results are provided in Supplementary Material S4.

It can be concluded from these results that the Ncut method is effective in reproducing the cluster structure in the gene trees from the BHV distances, and the NJp method gives superior results for clustering than the MLE methods. We therefore propose to use the NJp method for constructing gene trees, and to apply Ncut to clustering based on distance matrices in the BHV tree space.




Figure 2: Two dimensional plots by KPCA and t-SNE with the ration of species depths $c = 0.8$ and 1.2 . The colors indicates the correct clustering, which are not known in the dimension reduction procedures.

	NJp			MLE-HKY			(a) $c = 0.8$
	KPCA	t-SNE	direct	KPCA	t-SNE	direct	
BHV	0.869	0.819	0.858	0.514	0.718	0.616	
Euclid	0.783	0.797	0.712	0.664	0.772	0.502	
	NJp			MLE-HKY			(b) $c = 1.2$
	KPCA	t-SNE	direct	KPCA	t-SNE	direct	
BHV	0.985	0.978	0.981	0.676	0.944	0.822	
Euclid	0.957	0.953	0.959	0.868	0.922	0.610	

Table 1: Comparison of clustering accuracy between BHV space and Euclidean spaces. Euclidean distance gives worse results than geodesic distances in the BHV tree space. BHV geodesic distance with NJp tree construction is the most suitable for clustering.

2.2 Genome data set on coelacanths, lungfishes, and tetrapod

We have applied the clustering methods to the data set comprising 1,290 nuclear genes encoding 690,838 amino acid residues obtained from genome and transcriptome data by Liang *et al.* (2013). Over the last decades, the phylogenetic relations between coelacanths, lungfishes, and tetrapods have been controversial despite there has been much work on the data set (Hedges, 2009). The most studies, morphological, and paleontological studies support the hypothesis that the lungfishes are closer than coelacanths to the tetrapods (Tree 1 in Figure 1 from Liang *et al.* (2013)), however, some studies support the hypothesis that the coelacanths are closer to the tetrapods (Tree 2 in Figure 1 from Liang *et al.* (2013)). Others support the hypothesis that the coelacanths and the lungfishes form a sister clades (Tree 3 in Figure 1 from Liang *et al.* (2013)) or tetrapodes, lungfishes, and coelacanths cannot be resolved (Tree 4 in Figure 1 from Liang *et al.* (2013)). In this subsection we apply the clustering methods to the genome data set from Liang *et al.* (2013) and analyze on each cluster.

We applied the three clustering methods (with or without a dimension reduction) to the distance matrix computed from the set of gene trees constructed by the NJp method. The number of clusters in N_{cut} was set two. FIG. 3 shows the clustering results with KPCA and t-SNE, plotted on the three dimensional space found by the dimension reduction. The red and blue colors show the two clusters, where the color density represents the bootstrap confidence explained below. The clustering results with the bootstrap confidence are provided in Supplementary Material S5.

To evaluate the stability of clustering, we computed a bootstrap confidence probability for each gene. Namely, given $N \times N$ distance




Figure 3: Clustering of the genome data set. The two clusters are depicted in red and blue with bootstrap confidence shown by color density.




Figure 4: Cumulative distribution functions of confidence values for clustering. The two clusters are reliable, while the three clusters are unstable.

matrix (D_{ij}) as an input to the Ncut algorithm, we generate random resampling $\{i_1, \dots, i_N\}$ from $\{1, \dots, N\}$ with replacement, and apply Ncut to $(D_{i_a i_b})_{a,b=1}^N$. We repeated this procedure 100 times with independent random indices, and computed the ratio that a gene is classified in the same cluster as the one given by (D_{ij}) .

We computed the bootstrap confidence for all 1290 genes. The cumulative distribution functions of these values are shown for the tree clustering methods in FIG. 4 (left). The ratio of genes with confidence above 0.95 is 91.4%, 83.8%, and 99.2% for direct direct Ncut, KPCA Ncut, and t-SNE Ncut, respectively. As comparison, we computed the bootstrap confidence for Ncut with three clusters. FIG. 4 (right) shows the cumulative distribution function, which clearly shows that three clusters are unstable. From these observations, we see that the two clusters obtained by the methods are not artifacts but a stable structure in the genome data.

The clusters obtained by the three methods look different in their

(a) TH=0.90				
$A \setminus B$	direct	KPCA	t-SNE	N_A
Direct	-	0.917	0.800	1207
KPCA	0.912	-	0.757	1135
t-SNE	0.812	0.785	-	1284
(b) TH = 0.95				
$A \setminus B$	direct	KPCA	t-SNE	N_A
Direct	-	0.896	0.786	1180
KPCA	0.886	-	0.712	1081
t-SNE	0.803	0.757	-	1280

Table 2: Agreement of clusters among the three methods. The rightmost column shows the number of selected genes for each method (N_A).

shapes. We then examined agreements of the clusters at the gene level. After extracting the genes with bootstrap confidence not less than TH, (TH = 0.90 or 0.95), we evaluated the agreement of methods A and B by

$$t_{AB} := \frac{|C_A^1 \cap C_B^1| + |C_A^2 \cap C_B^2|}{N_A},$$

where N_A is the number of genes by Method A with confidence larger than TH and C_A^i is the i -th ($i = 1, 2$) cluster by Method A ($N_A = |C_A^1| + |C_A^2|$). We identified which cluster in A corresponds to a cluster B by the number of common genes. Table 2 shows the value t_{AB} for every pair of the three methods. We can see that majority of genes in a cluster agrees to another cluster given by a different method. This confirms that the clustering reveals the structure of the data. KPCA Ncut and t-SNE Ncut are slightly less consistent, which may be caused by the difference of N_A for the two methods.

Finally we conducted the phylogenetic analysis on the clusters of gene trees. For each clustering method (direct Ncut, KPCA Ncut with, or t-SNE Ncut), we have reconstructed a consensus tree from each cluster. To construct the consensus tree, we have used the gene trees in each cluster with bootstrap value greater than 0.95 and took the majority rule with more than 50% for reconstructing the consensus tree for resolving each split on the tree. With all the clustering methods, the result suggests that there are two clusters in the genome-wide data set on coelacanths, lungfishes, and tetrapods: the number of genes are (858, 322), (761, 320), and (817, 463) for direct Ncut, KPCA Ncut and t-SNE Ncut, respectively. Note that we used only gene trees with bootstrap confidence ≥ 0.95 . Thus the number of two clusters might not sum upto 1290.

With all of the three methods, direct Ncut, Ncut with KPCA, and Ncut with t-SNE, one cluster of the gene trees provides the tree topology Tree 4 from Figure 1 in Liang *et al.* (2013), while the other cluster




Figure 5: The majority rule consensus tree consists of gene trees with more than 0.95 bootstrap values in each cluster. Each split in the trees is resolved only if we have majority, i.e. 50% of all given gene trees in each set agree.

gives the tree topology Tree 2 from Figure 1 in Liang *et al.* (2013) (see FIG. 5).

We have also reconstructed a tree from each cluster by concatenating the alignments using the software `PhyloBayes 3.3` under a mixture model CAT + Γ 4 with two independent MCMC runs for 10,000 cycles. However, we did not observe any difference in the tree topologies, i.e., the reconstructed trees have all the same tree topology as Tree 1 in from Figure 1 in Liang *et al.* (2013) (see FIG. 6).

3 Discussion

In this paper we have shown the two main results: the Ncut clustering algorithm works well on the gene trees reconstructed via the NJp under the evolutionary models; and via the Ncut clustering algorithm we found two clusters on the genome data sets from Liang *et al.* (2013).

Simulations: As we have shown by simulations in the section Results, the Ncut algorithm works effectively on the set of gene trees reconstructed via the NJp method compared with the trees reconstructed via the MLE under the evolutionary models (Table 2, FIGs. 1 and 2). It is not clear why this phenomena happened in our simulations and it is of interest to investigate mathematically the reason of this phenomena.

Coelacanth, lungfishes, and tetrapods data set: Using the Ncut algorithm on the gene trees reconstructed via the NJp method, we have found the two clusters. the bootstrap confidence analysis suggests that there are two reliable clusters and it would be very unlikely to have more than two clusters. From the two clusters we found via the Ncut




Figure 6: The trees reconstructed the concatenated alignments from each cluster computed by the direct ncut. We used the Bayesian inference using the software *PhyloBayes* 3.3 under a mixture model CAT + Γ 4 with two independent MCMC runs for 10,000 cycles.

algorithm, we have reconstructed the consensus trees and their tree topologies did not support the hypothesis that the lungfishes are the closest living relatives of the tetrapods as of the result in Liang *et al.* (2013), but supported the hypotheses that the coelacanth is most closely related to the tetrapods, and that the coelacanth, lungfish, and tetrapod lineages diverged within a very short time interval. Since clustering analysis with Ncut does not infer any evolutionary events that cause the clusters, it would be interesting and important to investigate further how these clusters were made in the evolutionary history.

4 Materials and Methods

4.1 Billera-Holmes-Vogtmann Tree Space

Billera *et al.* (2001) introduced a continuous space that models the set of rooted phylogenetic trees with edge lengths on a fixed set of leaves. (Unrooted trees can be accommodated by using either the Ferras transform, or by designating an arbitrary leaf node as the root.) It is known that in the *Billera-Holmes-Vogtmann (BHV) tree space* any two points are connected by a geodesic, and the distance between two trees is defined as the *length of the geodesic* connecting them.

Consider a rooted tree with n leaves. Such a tree has at most $2n - 2$ edges; there are n terminal edges, which are connected to leaves, and as many as $n - 2$ internal edges. The maximum number of edges is achieved when the tree is binary, but the number of edges can be lower if the tree contains any polytomies. With each distinct tree topology,

we associate a Euclidean *orthant* of dimension equal to the number of edges that the topology possesses. (Here, we may regard an orthant to be the subset of \mathbb{R}^d with all coordinates non-negative.) For each topology, the orthant coordinates correspond to edge lengths in the tree.

Since all tree topologies have the same set of n terminal leaves, and each of these leaves is associated with a single terminal edge, the orthant coordinates associated with the terminal edges are of less interest than those of internal nodes. As a result, we will simplify our discussion by ignoring the terminal edge lengths, and concern ourselves primarily with the portion of each orthant which describes the internal edges. (Recall that this space has at most $n - 2$ dimensions.)

Since each of the coordinates in a simplified orthant corresponds to an internal edge length, the orthant boundaries (where at least one coordinate is zero) represent trees with collapsed internal edges. These points can be thought of as trees with slightly different—but closely related—topologies. The BHV space is constructed by noting that the boundary trees from two different orthants may describe the same polytomic topology. With this insight, we may set about constructing the space by grafting orthant boundaries together when the trees they represent coincide.

Since each orthant is locally a Euclidean space, the shortest path between two points within a single orthant is a straight line. The difficulty comes in establishing which sequence of orthants joining the two topologies will contain the geodesic. In the case of four leaves, we could do this through a brute-force search, but we cannot hope to do so with larger trees. Owen and Provan (2011) present a quartic-time algorithm (in the number of leaves n) for finding the geodesic path between any two points in the space. Once the geodesic is known, computing its length—and thus the distance between the trees—is a simple matter.

4.2 Clustering algorithm

Given a set of gene trees for the species in analysis, a clustering algorithm is applied based on the distance matrix containing the geodesic distances in the BHV tree space. As an alternative procedure, dimension reduction may be applied before the clustering. This is helpful for visualization of distribution of data. For the details of the clustering and dimension reduction methods, see Supplementary Material S1.

4.2.1 Clustering

The clustering method employed in our analysis is the Ncut (Shi and Malik, 2000), which can be applied only with a similarity or dissimi-

larity matrix; the coordinates of original data points are not necessary.

An undirected weighted graph is used to represent similarity structure of data, where each node corresponds to a data point and the weight between two nodes is their similarity. The Ncut provides segmentation of the nodes so that they are similar within a group and dissimilar between different groups. For a partition $\{A, B\}$ of the nodes V , the objective function to minimize is

$$\text{Ncut}(A, B) = \frac{\text{Cut}(A, B)}{\text{assoc}(A, V)} + \frac{\text{Cut}(A, B)}{\text{assoc}(B, V)},$$

where

$$\text{Cut}(A, B) := \sum_{i \in A, j \in B} w_{ij},$$

and $\text{assoc}(A, V) = \sum_{i \in A, j \in V} w_{ij}$ ($\text{assoc}(B, V)$ is similar). An approximate algorithm is known using a generalized eigenproblem, providing a simple and efficient method. In our experiments, the similarity w_{ij} is given by $w_{ij} = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} D_{ij}^2)$, where D_{ij} is the distance matrix, and $\sigma = 1.2 \times \text{Median}\{D_{ij} \mid i \neq j\}$.

Ncut has been applied to various problems, including image segmentation (Shi and Malik, 2000, Carballido-Gamio *et al.*, 2004, Yao *et al.*, 2012), biology (Xing and Karp, 2001, Higham *et al.*, 2007), and social networks (Newman, 2013).

There are many other standard methods for clustering: K-means and hierarchical clustering, among others. The K-means algorithm needs to update the distance from centroids in each iteration, which is very expensive in our case of BHV tree space. In contrast, the Ncut method needs only eigendecomposition of the similarity matrix, and computationally efficient. The hierarchical clustering can be applied to distance matrices, and we will show comparison with Ncut for gene tree data sets in the section Results.

4.2.2 Dimension reduction

As an optional procedure before Ncut clustering, a low dimensional expression of gene trees may be extracted from the distance matrix. Among various dimension reduction methods, kernel principal component analysis (KPCA, Schölkopf *et al.*, 1998) and t-stochastic neighborhood embedding (t-SNE, van der Maaten and Hinton, 2008) are chosen for our analysis by preliminary experiments (see Supplementary Material S1). Those methods extracted three dimensional expression of data, when applied, and the Ncut was applied to the Euclidean distance matrix among the three dimensional data points.

KPCA is a nonlinear extension of the standard principal component analysis (PCA); it applies PCA to feature vectors, which are given by

nonlinear mapping of the original data to a feature space. The nonlinear map is defined by a *positive definite kernel*, and the feature space is a possibly infinite dimensional Hilbert space provided implicitly by the positive definite kernel. KPCA gives nonlinear functions f_1, \dots, f_d of data points $(X_i)_{i=1}^N$ so that $(f_1(X_i), \dots, f_d(X_i))_{i=1}^N$ can serve as a d -dimensional representation of data. The analysis of this paper uses Gaussian kernel $k(X_i, X_j) = \exp(-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} D_{ij}^2)$ where D_{ij} is the distance matrix of the gene trees¹.

t-SNE is a method for low-dimensional expression or visualization of high-dimensional data; it typically extracts two or three dimensional expression. Given $(X_i)_{i=1}^N$ in a high-dimensional space, t-SNE first computes a probability p_{ij} based on the distance matrix so that a high probability implies similarity of X_i and X_j . The method then provides a low dimensional expression $(Y_i)_{i=1}^N$ in such a way that a probability q_{ij} defined similarly for a pair (Y_i, Y_j) is close to (p_{ij}) . The points $(Y_i)_{i=1}^N$ are found with numerical optimization to minimize the Kullback-Leibler divergence between (p_{ij}) and (q_{ij}) . In our experiments, a Matlab implementation by van der Maaten (lvdmaaten.github.io/tsne/) is used. The perplexity parameter, which gives a way of determining local bandwidth parameters, is set 30 in our experiments.

5 Supplementary Material

Supplementary Materials S1–S5 are available at Molecular Biology and Evolution online (<http://www.mbe.oxfordjournals.org/>).

6 Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by JSPS KAKENHI 26540016.

References

- Amemiya, C. T., Alföldi, J., and et. al. 2013. The african coelacanth genome provides insights into tetrapod evolution. *Nature*, 496: 311–316.
- Betancur, R., Li, C., Munroe, T., Ballesteros, J., and Ortí, G. 2013. Addressing gene tree discordance and non-stationarity to resolve

¹While this kernel with an arbitrary distance matrix D is not necessarily positive definite, in our analysis the Gram matrices $k(X_i, X_j)$ made by the given data were positive definite.

- a multi-locus phylogeny of the flatfishes (teleostei: Pleuronectiformes). *Systematic Biology*, page doi:10.1093/sysbio/syt039.
- Billera, L., Holmes, S., and Vogtmann, K. 2001. Geometry of the space of phylogenetic trees. *Adv. in Appl. Math.*, 27(4): 733–767.
- Bollback, J. and Huelsenbeck, J. 2009. Parallel genetic evolution within and between bacteriophage species of varying degrees of divergence. *Genetics*, 181(1): 225–234.
- Brito, P. and Edwards, S. 2009. Multilocus phylogeography and phylogenetics using sequence-based markers. *Genetica*, 135: 439–455.
- Carballido-Gamio, J., Belongie, S., and Majumdar, S. 2004. Normalized cuts in 3-d for spinal mri segmentation. *Medical Imaging, IEEE Transactions on*, 23(1): 36–44.
- Carling, M. and Brumfield, R. 2008. Integrating phylogenetic and population genetic analyses of multiple loci to test species divergence hypotheses in passerina buntings. *Genetics*, 178: 363–377.
- Edwards, S. 2009. Is a new and general theory of molecular systematics emerging? *Evolution*, 63: 1–19.
- Felsenstein, J. 1981. Evolutionary trees from DNA sequences: a maximum likelihood approach. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 17: 368–376.
- Fritzsche, B. 1987. The inner ear of the coelacanth fish latimeria has tetrapod affinities. *Nature*, 327: 153–154.
- Gorr, T., Kleinschmidt, T., and Fricke, H. 1991. Close tetrapod relationships of the coelacanth latimeria indicated by haemoglobin sequences. *Nature*, 351: 394–397.
- Guindon, S. and Gascuel, O. 2003. A simple, fast, and accurate algorithm to estimate large phylogenies by maximum likelihood. *Systematic Biology*, 52(5): 696–704.
- Hasegawa, M., Kishino, H., and Yano, T. 1985. Dating of the human-ape splitting by a molecular clock of mitochondrial dna. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 22: 160–174.
- Hedges, S. 2009. Vertebrates (vertebrata). In: *Hedges SB, Kumar S, editors. The timetree of life*, pages 309–314.
- Heled, J. and Drummond, A. 2011. Bayesian inference of species trees from multilocus data. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 27(3): 570–580.

- Higham, D., Kalna, G., and Kibble, . 2007. Spectral clustering and its use in bioinformatics. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 204(1): 25 – 37. Special issue dedicated to Professor Shinnosuke Oharu on the occasion of his 65th birthday.
- Huson, D. H., Klopper, T., Lockhart, P. J., and Steel, M. A. 2005. *Reconstruction of reticulate networks from gene trees*. Research in Computational Molecular Biology, Proceedings. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Berlin.
- Kimura, M. 1980. A simple method for estimating evolutionary rates of base substitution through comparative studies of nucleotide sequences. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 16: 111–120.
- Liang, D., Shen, X., and Zhang, P. 2013. One thousand two hundred ninety nuclear genes from a genome-wide survey support lungfishes as the sister group of tetrapods. *Mol Biol Evol.*, 30(8): 1803–1807.
- Maddison, W. P. 1997. Gene trees in species trees. *Systematic Biology*, 46(3): 523–536.
- Maddison, W. P. and Maddison, D. 2009. Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis. version 2.72. Available at <http://mesquiteproject.org>.
- Martin, A. P. and Burg, T. M. 2002. Perils of paralogy: Using hsp70 genes for inferring organismal phylogenies. *Systematic Biology*, 51: 570–587.
- Newman, M. E. J. 2013. Spectral methods for community detection and graph partitioning. *Phys. Rev. E*, 88: 042822.
- Owen, M. and Provan, J. S. 2011. A fast algorithm for computing geodesic distances in tree space. *IEEE ACM T COMPUT BI*, 8(1): 2–13.
- Pamilo, P. and Nei, M. 1988. Relationships between gene trees and species trees. *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 5: 568–583.
- Posada, D. and Crandall, K. 2002. The effect of recombination on the accuracy of phylogeny reconstruction. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*, 54: 396–402.
- Rivera, M. C., Jain, R., Moore, J. E., and Lake, J. A. 1998. Genomic evidence for two functionally distinct gene classes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 95(11): 6239–6244.

- Roch, S. and Steel, M. 2015. Likelihood-based tree reconstruction on a concatenation of alignments can be positively misleading. *Theoretical Population Biology*, 100: 56–62.
- Saitou, N. and Nei, M. 1987. The neighbor joining method: a new method for reconstructing phylogenetic trees. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, 4(4): 406–425.
- Schölkopf, B., Smola, A., and Müller, K.-R. 1998. Nonlinear component analysis as a kernel eigenvalue problem. *Neural Computation*, 10: 1299–1319.
- Shi, J. and Malik, J. 2000. Normalized cuts and image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 22(8): 888–905.
- Takahata, N. 1989. Gene genealogy in 3 related populations: consistency probability between gene and population trees. *Genetics*, 122: 957–966.
- Takahata, N. and Nei, M. 1990. Allelic genealogy under overdominant and frequency-dependent selection and polymorphism of major histocompatibility complex loci. *Genetics*, 124: 967–978.
- Takezaki, N., Figueroa, F., Zaleska-Rutczynska, Z., Takahata, N., and Klein, J. 2004. The phylogenetic relationship of tetrapod, coelacanth, and lungfish revealed by the sequences of forty-four nuclear genes. *Mol Biol Evol*, 21: 1512–1524.
- Taylor, J. W., Jacobson, D. J., Kroken, S., Kasuga, T., Geiser, D. M., Hibbett, D. S., and Fisher, M. C. 2000. Phylogenetic species recognition and species concepts in fungi. *Fungal Genetics and Biology*, 31: 21 – 32.
- Thompson, K. and Kubatko, L. 2013. Using ancestral information to detect and localize quantitative trait loci in genome-wide association studies. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 14: 200.
- van der Maaten, L. and Hinton, G. 2008. Visualizing high-dimensional data using t-SNE. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9: 2579–2605.
- Weisrock, D. W., Shaffer, H. B., Storz, B. L., Storz, S. R., Storz, S. R., and Voss, S. R. 2006. Multiple nuclear gene sequences identify phylogenetic species boundaries in the rapidly radiating clade of mexican ambystomatid salamanders. *Molecular Ecology*, 15: 2489–2503.

- Xing, E. and Karp, R. 2001. CLIFF: clustering of high-dimensional microarray data via iterative feature filtering using normalized cuts. *Bioinformatics*, 17(suppl 1): S306–S315.
- Yang, Z. 1997. PAML: A program package for phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood. *CABIOS*, 15: 555–556.
- Yao, W., Krzystek, P., and Heurich, M. 2012. Tree species classification and estimation of stem volume and {DBH} based on single tree extraction by exploiting airborne full-waveform lidar data. *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 123(0): 368 – 380.
- Yu, Y., Warnow, T., and Nakhleh, L. 2011. Algorithms for mdc-based multi-locus phylogeny inference: Beyond rooted binary gene trees on single alleles. *J Comput Biol*, 18(11): 1543–1559.